arXiv:1510.07028v1 [math.NA] 22 Oct 2015

Regularization in Ambient Space for Recovering Tangential Vector Fields

Guozhi Dong[*], Thomas Takacs[†], Bert Jüttler[‡], Otmar Scherzer[§]

Abstract

We study regularization methods for solving ill–posed operator equations where the solutions are tangent vector fields. We review the classical regularization theory which applies to the infinite dimensional problem. In order to analyze the effect of approximations we extend the operator equation and spaces to ambient operators and spaces, respectively, and propose regularization methods for ambient functions. As an advantage of our approach, we can calculate error estimates for perturbed surfaces, which cannot be tackled with the existing theory of regularization methods for discretized spaces. We also highlight some practical applications, such as Doppler imaging and optical flow computations.

Keywords: Regularization method, tangent vector field, ambient space, surface approximation

MSC 2010: 47A52, 53B20, 46C99

1 Introduction

We are interested in solving linear *inverse problems*

$$\widetilde{F}\widetilde{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{y}\,, \tag{1.1}$$

where $\widetilde{F} : \widetilde{\mathcal{X}_1} \to \mathcal{X}_2$ is a bounded operator between Hilbert spaces of functions defined on *surfaces*. In the applications we have in mind (see Section 4) $\widetilde{\mathcal{X}_1}$ denotes a space of function defined on a surface $\mathcal{M}$ into the *tangential vector*

[*]Computational Science Center, University of Vienna, Oskar Morgenstern-Platz 1, 1090 Vienna, Austria (guozhi.dong@univie.ac.at)

[†]Faculty of Mathematics, University of Pavia, Via Adolfo Ferrata 5, 27100 Pavia, Italy (thomas.takacs@unipv.it)

[‡]Institute of Applied Geometry, Johannes Kepler University of Linz,Altenberger Str. 69, A-4040 Linz, Austria (bert.juettler@jku.at)

[§]Computational Science Center, University of Vienna, Oskar Morgenstern-Platz 1, 1090 Vienna, and Johann Radon Institute for Computational and Applied Mathematics (RICAM), Austrian Academy of Sciences, Altenberger Str. 69, A-4040 Linz, Austria (otmar.scherzer@univie.ac.at)

bundle $\mathcal{TM}$. Whenever we talk about spaces of functions with the range in the tangent bundle we emphasize this with a superscript tilde.

We assume that solving (1.1) is ill-posed and requires some regularization to approximate the solution in a stable way. The regularization method of choice for solving (1.1) is Tikhonov-regularization, consisting in minimization of the functional

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\alpha,\mathbf{y}^\delta}(\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}) := \left\| \widetilde{F}\widetilde{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{y}^\delta \right\|_{\mathcal{X}_2}^2 + \alpha \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}(\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}) \tag{1.2}$$

over $\widetilde{\mathcal{X}_1}$. Here $\mathbf{y}^\delta$ denotes some approximation of the exact data $\mathbf{y}$, from which we assume that

$$\left\| \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{y}^\delta \right\|_{\mathcal{X}_2} \leq \delta \, . \tag{1.3}$$

Moreover, $\alpha > 0$ is a regularization parameter, and $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}$ is an appropriate regularization functional. In contrast to previous work [9, 21, 31, 7, 29, 32, 27, 28] we are emphasizing on a surface setting, where $\widetilde{\mathcal{X}_1}$ is an Hilbert-space of functions with range in the tangent vector bundle of a surface, and $\mathcal{X}_2$ is another Hilbert-space.

The analysis of Tikhonov regularization has advanced from a theory for solving ill–posed operator equations in a Hilbert-space setting (both in a finite and an infinite dimensional setting) [30, 9, 21, 29] to more complex situations, when F is nonlinear [2, 31, 7, 32] or with sophisticated regularization [3, 26, 11, 27, 25, 28, 22].

The analysis of finite dimensional approximations of regularizers in infinite dimensional spaces (see for instance [24, 25, 15]) is highly relevant for this work. The results of [25] are already quite general, but do *not* cover approximations of solutions of (1.1) with ranges in the tangent vector bundle of a surface. This is because when in (1.1) the surface is approximated, the according approximative equations also have to be formulated on spaces of functions on surfaces $\mathcal{M}_\sigma$ approximating $\mathcal{M}$. In this paper the differential geometrical concept of a pullback is used to take the variation in spaces into account, and this makes it possible to compare functions defined on different surfaces. The second issue is, that the functions we aim to recover, have ranges in their *tangent bundles*, and consequently, and additional complication is due to the fact that also the ranges of the functions have to be approximated, which is not covered by the existing convergence literature either. To resolve this issue we embed (1.1) in an *ambient* space, in which the functions with range in the tangent bundles can be compared.

We consider two applications: *Pulsed Wave Doppler (PWD) imaging* is an effective tool for monitoring vascular and cardiac function [8]. By analyzing the Doppler frequency-shift from the transmitted and the received signals, a PWD system is able to retrieve a set of axial velocity, which allows to estimate the wall shear stresses near the inner wall of arteries and vessels [16, 12, 5, 10, 20]. In [1], a computational method is proposed to recover a dense velocity field. It reconstructs the motion field for each planar slice. We consider to recover a shape of the observed tissue or vessel a-priori, which is considered a surface, and

then to reconstruct the dense velocity field on that surface. The second application concerns *optical flow estimation* on surfaces (see [18, 13, 14] for instance), which is explained in detail in Section 4. To show the main ideas better, we put the underlying differential geometric concepts including all the basic notations in the Appendix. The rest of the paper is organized as follows: Section 2 reviews regularization methods on tangent spaces in an infinite dimensional setting, which can be analyzed by existing regularization theory. In Section 3, we discuss regularization in ambient spaces for recovering tangent vector fields. We perform an extended regularization analysis to derive general convergence and convergence rates taking into account disturbed or approximated surfaces, which cannot be handled with the existing theory. Finally, we present some applications in Section 4.

2 Regularization for Functions on the Tangent Spaces

We first recall some classical regularization theory in the infinite dimensional Hilbert space setting, and then, clarify proper spaces for further investigation.

2.1 Classical Results in Regularization Theory

Below we review results from the regularization literature (see [9, 7]), which provide well-posedness, convergence and stability of Tikhonov regularization. For this purpose we summarize the basic assumptions needed throughout this paper.

Assumption 2.1. *In the context of Tikhonov regularization* (1.2) *we consider the following:*

1. *Let $\widetilde{\mathcal{X}_1}$, $\mathcal{X}_2$ be two Hilbert spaces of functions.*
2. *$\widetilde{F} : \mathcal{D}(\widetilde{F}) \subseteq \widetilde{\mathcal{X}_1} \to \mathcal{X}_2$ is a bounded linear operator with domain $\mathcal{D}(\widetilde{F})$, which is weakly closed.*
3. *$\widetilde{\mathcal{R}} : \widetilde{\mathcal{X}_1} \to [0, \infty]$ is a proper, convex, and weakly lower-semi continuous functional satisfying $\widetilde{\mathcal{D}} := \mathcal{D}(\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}) \cap \mathcal{D}(\widetilde{F}) \neq \emptyset$.*
4. *For every $\alpha, \theta > 0$ the sets $\widetilde{M}_{\alpha,\mathbf{y}}(\theta) := \left\{ \widetilde{\mathbf{x}} \in \widetilde{\mathcal{X}_1} : \widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\alpha,\mathbf{y}}(\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}) \leq \theta \right\}$ are weakly sequentially compact.*

Based on Assumption 2.1 we recall the basic regularization results.

Theorem 2.2. *Let $\widetilde{F}$, $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}$, $\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}$, $\widetilde{\mathcal{X}_1}$ and $\mathcal{X}_2$ satisfy Assumption 2.1, and the data error is given as* (1.3)*.*

- *Assume that $\alpha > 0$. Then there exists a minimizer of $\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\alpha,\mathbf{y}^\delta}$.*

- *If* $(\mathbf{y}_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ *is a sequence converging to* $\mathbf{y}$ *in* $\mathcal{X}_2$*, then every sequence*

$$\left(\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}_k := \arg\min\left\{\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\alpha,\mathbf{y}_k}(\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}) : \widetilde{\mathbf{x}} \in \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}\right\}\right)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$$

has a weakly convergent subsequence in $\widetilde{\mathcal{X}_1}$*, and the limit is a minimizer of* $\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\alpha,\mathbf{y}}$*.*

- *If there exists* $\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}_0 \in \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}$ *such that*

$$\widetilde{F}\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}_0 = Y \ . \tag{2.1}$$

Then there exists an $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}$ *minimizing solution* $\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}^\dagger$*. That is*

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}(\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}^\dagger) = \min\left\{\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}(\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}) : \widetilde{\mathbf{x}} \in \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}, \widetilde{F}\widetilde{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{y}\right\} \ .$$

- *Assume that* $\alpha = \alpha(\delta) : (0,\infty) \to (0,\infty)$ *satisfies*

$$\alpha \to 0\,, \frac{\delta^2}{\alpha} \to 0\,, \ \textit{as } \delta \to 0. \tag{2.2}$$

Let $(\mathbf{y}_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ *satisfy* $\|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{y}_k\|_{\mathcal{X}_2} \le \delta_k$ *and set* $\alpha_k = \alpha(\delta_k)$*. Then every sequence* $(\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}_k = argmin\left\{\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\alpha_k,\mathbf{y}_k}(\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}) : \widetilde{\mathbf{x}} \in \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}\right\})$ *has a weakly convergent subsequence, and the limit is an* $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}$*-minimizing solution.*

In order to apply the general results to concrete applications we have to specify appropriate function spaces to characterize vector fields.

2.2 Spaces of Functions with Ranges in Tangent Bundles

In the following we summarize function spaces of vector fields $\mathbf{x} : \mathcal{M} \to \mathbb{R}^3$ and $\widetilde{\mathbf{x}} : \mathcal{M} \to \mathcal{T}\mathcal{M}$, defined on a two-dimensional surface $\mathcal{M}$, with ranges in $\mathbb{R}^3$ or in tangent bundles, respectively, which are used throughout the paper. We emphasize the notation that a function with a superscript $\widetilde{\cdot}$ has range in the tangent bundle.

The basic definitions, such as the projection operators onto the tangent bundle $\mathcal{P}_\tau$ and onto its normal $\mathcal{P}_{\vec{\mathbf{n}}}$, which are used in the Definitions below, are defined in the Appendix A of this paper.

Definition 2.3.

- $L^2(\mathcal{M})$ is the space of square integrable, scalar, vector, and matrix valued functions - we do not notationally distinguish among them. The inner products and norms are defined by

$$\langle X_1, X_2\rangle_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} := \int_{\mathcal{M}} X_1 \cdot X_2 \, ds(x)\,, \quad \|X\|^2_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} = \langle X, X\rangle_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} \ ,$$

respectively. Note that if X_1, X_2 are scalar valued functions, then $\cdot$ is just standard multiplication and for vectors and matrices $\cdot$ is component wise multiplication.

- We define the sets

$$\begin{aligned}
\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^1_{\mathcal{T}\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{M}) &:= \left\{\widetilde{\mathbf{x}} : \mathcal{M} \to \mathbb{R}^3 : \widetilde{\mathbf{x}}(x) \in \mathcal{T}_x\mathcal{M} \text{ for all } x \in \mathcal{M} \right. \\
&\qquad \left. \text{and } \|\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}\|_{\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^1_{\mathcal{T}\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{M})} < \infty \right\}, \\
\mathcal{H}^1_{\mathcal{N}}(\mathcal{M}) &:= \left\{\mathbf{n} : \mathcal{M} \to \mathbb{R}^3 : \mathbf{n}(x) \in \mathcal{N}_x\mathcal{M} \text{ for all } x \in \mathcal{M} \right. \\
&\qquad \left. \text{and } \|\mathbf{n}\|_{\mathcal{H}^1_{\mathcal{N}}(\mathcal{M})} < \infty \right\}, \\
\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M}) &:= \left\{\mathbf{x} = \widetilde{\mathbf{x}} + \mathbf{n} : \widetilde{\mathbf{x}} \in \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^1_{\mathcal{T}\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{M}) \text{ and } \mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{H}^1_{\mathcal{N}}(\mathcal{M}) \right. \\
&\qquad \left. \text{and } \|\mathbf{x}\|_{\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M})} < \infty \right\}, \\
H^1(\mathcal{M}) &:= \left\{\mathbf{x} : \mathcal{M} \to \mathbb{R}^3 \text{ and } \|\mathbf{x}\|_{H^1(\mathcal{M})} < \infty \right\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.3}$$

  The associated inner products for elements $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}$ and norms for $A = \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^1_{\mathcal{T}\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{M})$, $\mathcal{H}^1_{\mathcal{N}}(\mathcal{M}), \mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M})$, and $H^1(\mathcal{M})$ are defined by

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \rangle_A &:= \langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \rangle_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} + \langle U, V \rangle_{L^2(\mathcal{M})}, \\
\|\mathbf{u}\|_A^2 &:= \langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u} \rangle_A \text{ and } |\mathbf{u}|_A^2 := \langle U, U \rangle_{L^2(\mathcal{M})},
\end{aligned}$$

  where

$$U = \begin{cases}
\mathcal{P}_\tau \nabla_{\mathcal{M}} \mathbf{u} & \text{for } \mathbf{u} \in \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^1_{\mathcal{T}\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{M}), \\
\mathcal{P}_{\vec{\mathbf{n}}} \nabla_{\mathcal{M}} \mathbf{u} & \text{for } \mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{H}^1_{\mathcal{N}}(\mathcal{M}), \\
\mathcal{P}_\tau \nabla_{\mathcal{M}} \mathcal{P}_\tau \mathbf{u} + \mathcal{P}_{\vec{\mathbf{n}}} \nabla_{\mathcal{M}} \mathcal{P}_{\vec{\mathbf{n}}} \mathbf{u} & \text{for } \mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M}), \\
\nabla_{\mathcal{M}} \mathbf{u} & \text{for } \mathbf{u} \in H^1(\mathcal{M}),
\end{cases}$$

  where $\mathcal{P}_{\vec{\mathbf{n}}}$, $\mathcal{P}_\tau$ are defined in (A.3) and $\nabla_{\mathcal{M}}$ denotes the gradient with respect to the surface, defined in (A.7).

In the following we prove that these spaces are in fact Hilbert spaces. Moreover, we prove some equivalence relations to the standard Sobolev space $H^1(\mathcal{M})$.

Lemma 2.4. *Let $\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M})$, $\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^1_{\mathcal{T}\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{M})$ and $\mathcal{H}^1_{\mathcal{N}}(\mathcal{M})$ as defined in Definition 2.3. Then $\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M})$ is the direct sum of $\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^1_{\mathcal{T}\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{M})$ and $\mathcal{H}^1_{\mathcal{N}}(\mathcal{M})$, that is,*

$$\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M}) = \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^1_{\mathcal{T}\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{M}) \oplus \mathcal{H}^1_{\mathcal{N}}(\mathcal{M}).$$

Proof. First we prove that $\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^1_{\mathcal{T}\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{M}) + \mathcal{H}^1_{\mathcal{N}}(\mathcal{M}) = \mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M})$. By definition $\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^1_{\mathcal{T}\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{M}) + \mathcal{H}^1_{\mathcal{N}}(\mathcal{M}) \subset \mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M})$. On the other hand Let $\widetilde{\mathbf{x}} = \mathcal{P}_\tau \mathbf{x}$ and $\mathbf{n} = \mathcal{P}_{\vec{\mathbf{n}}} \mathbf{x}$, then $\mathbf{x} = \widetilde{\mathbf{x}} + \mathbf{n}$, and thus $\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M}) \subset \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^1_{\mathcal{T}\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{M}) + \mathcal{H}^1_{\mathcal{N}}(\mathcal{M})$.

It remains to be proven that $\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^1_{\mathcal{T}\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{M})$ and $\mathcal{H}^1_{\mathcal{N}}(\mathcal{M})$ are orthogonal with respect to $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M})}$. For every $\widetilde{\mathbf{x}} \in \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^1_{\mathcal{T}\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{M})$ and $\mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{H}^1_{\mathcal{N}}(\mathcal{M})$, we have

$$\langle \widetilde{\mathbf{x}}, \mathbf{n} \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M})} = \left\langle \mathcal{P}_\tau \widetilde{\mathbf{x}}(x), \underbrace{\mathcal{P}_\tau \mathbf{n}(x)}_{=0} \right\rangle_{\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^1_{\mathcal{T}\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{M})} + \left\langle \underbrace{\mathcal{P}_{\vec{\mathbf{n}}} \widetilde{\mathbf{x}}(x)}_{=0}, \mathcal{P}_{\vec{\mathbf{n}}} \mathbf{n}(x) \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}^1_{\mathcal{N}}(\mathcal{M})}.$$

Thus, the orthogonality is proven and the result follows. ∎

In the following we show a few auxiliary results, which allow embedding the space $\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M})$. We note that $|\cdot|$ (without subscript) denotes the Euclidean norm of a vector or the Frobenius norm for a matrix.

Lemma 2.5. *The projection operators $\mathcal{P}_\tau$ and $\mathcal{P}_{\vec{\mathbf{n}}}$ are continuous from the standard Sobolev space H^1 to $\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^1_{\mathcal{T}\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{M})$ and $\mathcal{H}^1_{\mathcal{N}}(\mathcal{M})$, respectively. Moreover,*

$$\max\left\{\left|\mathcal{P}_\tau \mathbf{x}\right|, \left|\mathcal{P}_{\vec{\mathbf{n}}} \mathbf{x}\right|\right\} \leq |\mathbf{x}| \ . \tag{2.4}$$

Proof. Boundedness in the sense of (2.4) is a trivial property of the projections. Using the formulas from Lemma A.2 it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
|\mathcal{P}_\tau \mathbf{x}|_{\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M})} &= \|\mathcal{P}_\tau \nabla_{\mathcal{M}} (\mathcal{P}_\tau \mathbf{x})\|_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} \\
&= \left\|\mathcal{P}_\tau \nabla_{\mathcal{M}} \mathbf{x} - (\vec{\mathbf{n}}^T \mathbf{x}) \nabla_{\mathcal{M}} \vec{\mathbf{n}}\right\|_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} \\
&\leq \|\mathcal{P}_\tau \nabla_{\mathcal{M}} \mathbf{x}\|_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} + \left\|(\vec{\mathbf{n}}^T \mathbf{x}) \nabla_{\mathcal{M}} \vec{\mathbf{n}}\right\|_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} \\
&\leq \|\nabla_{\mathcal{M}} \mathbf{x}\|_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} + C_c \left\|\vec{\mathbf{n}}^T \mathbf{x}\right\|_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} \\
&\leq (1 + C_c) \|\mathbf{x}\|_{H^1(\mathcal{M})} \, .
\end{aligned}$$

The last inequality uses $\vec{\mathbf{n}}$ as a unit normal vector, and $C_c = 3 \|\nabla_{\mathcal{M}} \vec{\mathbf{n}}\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{M})}$ denotes the maximum curvature of the surface and the constant 3 is the dimension of the space. Then

$$\|\mathcal{P}_\tau \mathbf{x}\|^2_{\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M})} = \|\mathcal{P}_\tau \mathbf{x}\|^2_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} + |\mathcal{P}_\tau \mathbf{x}|^2_{\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M})} \leq (1 + (1 + C_c)^2) \|\mathbf{x}\|^2_{H^1(\mathcal{M})} \, .$$

For the operator $\mathcal{P}_{\vec{\mathbf{n}}} \mathbf{x}$ we get similar estimates,

$$\begin{aligned}
|\mathcal{P}_{\vec{\mathbf{n}}} \mathbf{x}|_{\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M})} &= \left\|\vec{\mathbf{n}}\vec{\mathbf{n}}^T \nabla_{\mathcal{M}} \mathbf{x} - (\vec{\mathbf{n}}\mathbf{x}^T) \nabla_{\mathcal{M}} \vec{\mathbf{n}}\right\|_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} \\
&\leq \left\|\vec{\mathbf{n}}\vec{\mathbf{n}}^T \nabla_{\mathcal{M}} \mathbf{x}\right\|_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} + \left\|(\vec{\mathbf{n}}\mathbf{x}^T) \nabla_{\mathcal{M}} \vec{\mathbf{n}}\right\|_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} \\
&\leq \|\nabla_{\mathcal{M}} \mathbf{x}\|_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} + C_c \left\|\vec{\mathbf{n}}\mathbf{x}^T\right\|_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} \\
&\leq (1 + C_c) \|\mathbf{x}\|_{H^1(\mathcal{M})} \, ,
\end{aligned}$$

as well as

$$\|\mathcal{P}_{\vec{\mathbf{n}}} \mathbf{x}\|^2_{\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M})} = \|\mathcal{P}_{\vec{\mathbf{n}}} \mathbf{x}\|^2_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} + |\mathcal{P}_{\vec{\mathbf{n}}} \mathbf{x}|^2_{\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M})} \leq (1 + (1 + C_c)^2) \|\mathbf{x}\|^2_{H^1(\mathcal{M})} \, .$$

Hence, the conclusion has been proved. □

Lemma 2.6. *Let $\mathbf{x} : \mathcal{M} \to \mathbb{R}^3$ be a vector valued function. The norm $\|\mathbf{x}\|_{\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M})}$ defined in (2.3) is equivalent to the standard H^1-Sobolev norm $\|\mathbf{x}\|_{H^1(\mathcal{M})}$ of vector valued functions, which is also given in (2.3). The constants appearing in the inequalities depends on the curvature of the surface $\mathcal{M}$.*

Proof. We first show

$$\|\mathbf{x}\|_{\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M})} \leq C_1 \|\mathbf{x}\|_{H^1(\mathcal{M})} \, .$$

This follows from Definition 2.3 and Lemma 2.5 with

$$\|\mathbf{x}\|^2_{\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M})} = \|\mathcal{P}_\tau \mathbf{x}\|^2_{\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M})} + \|\mathcal{P}_{\vec{\mathbf{n}}} \mathbf{x}\|^2_{\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M})} \leq 2(1 + (1 + C_c)^2) \|\mathbf{x}\|^2_{H^1(\mathcal{M})} .$$

Now we show

$$\|\mathbf{x}\|_{H^1(\mathcal{M})} \leq C_2 \|\mathbf{x}\|_{\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M})} .$$

Since $\mathcal{P}_\tau \mathbf{x} + \mathcal{P}_{\vec{\mathbf{n}}} \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}$, and by orthogonality, it is clear that

$$\|\mathbf{x}\|^2_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} = \|\mathcal{P}_\tau \mathbf{x}\|^2_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} + \|\mathcal{P}_{\vec{\mathbf{n}}} \mathbf{x}\|^2_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} .$$

From Lemma A.2, which is proved in the Appendix, we have

$$\mathcal{P}_\tau \nabla_{\mathcal{M}} (\mathcal{P}_\tau \mathbf{x}) + \mathcal{P}_{\vec{\mathbf{n}}} \nabla_{\mathcal{M}} (\mathcal{P}_{\vec{\mathbf{n}}} \mathbf{x}) = \nabla_{\mathcal{M}} \mathbf{x} - \vec{\mathbf{n}}^T \mathbf{x} \nabla_{\mathcal{M}} \vec{\mathbf{n}} + \vec{\mathbf{n}} \mathbf{x}^T \nabla_{\mathcal{M}} \vec{\mathbf{n}}.$$

and therefore

$$|\mathbf{x}|^2_{\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M})} = \left\| \nabla_{\mathcal{M}} \mathbf{x} - \vec{\mathbf{n}}^T \mathbf{x} \nabla_{\mathcal{M}} \vec{\mathbf{n}} + \vec{\mathbf{n}} \mathbf{x}^T \nabla_{\mathcal{M}} \vec{\mathbf{n}} \right\|^2_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} .$$

Then by triangle inequality and the same estimates in Lemma 2.5 we conclude

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla_{\mathcal{M}} \mathbf{x}\|_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} &\leq \left\| \nabla_{\mathcal{M}} \mathbf{x} - \vec{\mathbf{n}}^T \mathbf{x} \nabla_{\mathcal{M}} \vec{\mathbf{n}} + \vec{\mathbf{n}} \mathbf{x}^T \nabla_{\mathcal{M}} \vec{\mathbf{n}} \right\|_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} \\ &\quad + \left\| \vec{\mathbf{n}}^T \mathbf{x} \nabla_{\mathcal{M}} \vec{\mathbf{n}} - \vec{\mathbf{n}} \mathbf{x}^T \nabla_{\mathcal{M}} \vec{\mathbf{n}} \right\|_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} \\ &\leq |\mathbf{x}|_{\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M})} + 2C_c \|\mathbf{x}\|_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} . \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $\|\nabla_{\mathcal{M}} \mathbf{x}\|^2_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} \leq 2 |\mathbf{x}|^2_{\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M})} + 4C_c^2 \|\mathbf{x}\|^2_{L^2(\mathcal{M})}$, we have the estimate

$$\|\mathbf{x}\|^2_{H^1(\mathcal{M})} \leq (4C_c^2 + 3) \|\mathbf{x}\|^2_{\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M})} .$$

This conclude the proof. □

Remark 2.7 (on Lemma 2.6)**.** *Note that for $\mathbf{x} : \mathcal{M} \to \mathbb{R}^3$, and $\mathcal{M}$ being a (curved) surface, the induced semi-norm $|\mathbf{x}|_{\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M})}$ of the space $\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M})$ is in general not equivalent to the semi-norm $|\mathbf{x}|_{H^1(\mathcal{M})}$ of the standard Sobolev space H^1.*

With the discussion above, we can conclude that the spaces introduced in Definition 2.3 are actually Hilbert spaces.

Theorem 2.8. *The spaces $\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M})$, $\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^1_{\mathcal{T}\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{M})$ and $\mathcal{H}^1_{\mathcal{N}}(\mathcal{M})$ associated with the inner products $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M})}$, $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^1_{\mathcal{T}\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{M})}$ and $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^1_{\mathcal{N}}(\mathcal{M})}$, respectively, are Hilbert spaces.*

Proof. The first assertion follows by the equivalence of the Sobolev space $H^1(\mathcal{M})$ and $\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M})$. The second and the third ones are fulfilled because they are orthogonal subspaces of $\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M})$ and complement each other there. Hence $\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^1_{\mathcal{T}\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{M})$ and $\mathcal{H}^1_{\mathcal{N}}(\mathcal{M})$ are closed subspaces and thus they are Hilbert spaces. □

Remark 2.9. *We emphasize that all the norms in the Definition 2.3 are independent of the parametrization. The independence follows by the invariance of the surface gradient $\nabla_{\mathcal{M}}$ (cf. Lemma A.1) with respect to the parametrizations and the projection operators $\mathcal{P}_\tau$ and $\mathcal{P}_{\vec{\mathbf{n}}}$.*

We also stress that $|\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}|_{\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^1_{\mathcal{T}\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{M})}$ is a semi-norm of the covariant derivative: According to (A.9), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}|^2_{\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^1_{\mathcal{T}\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{M})} &= \int_{\mathcal{M}} |\mathcal{P}_\tau(x)\nabla_{\mathcal{M}}\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}(x)|^2 \, ds(x) \\
&\underbrace{=}_{\text{(A.9)}} \int_{\mathcal{M}} \left|(\widetilde{\nabla_{\mathcal{M}}}\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}(x)(\partial m(\zeta))^\dagger)\right|^2 ds(x) \\
&= \int_{\mathcal{M}} \operatorname{Tr}\left(\left(\widetilde{\nabla_{\mathcal{M}}}\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}(x)(\partial m(\zeta))^\dagger\right)\left(\widetilde{\nabla_{\mathcal{M}}}\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}(x)(\partial m(\zeta))^\dagger\right)^T\right) ds(x) \\
&\underbrace{=}_{\text{(A.4)}} \int_{\mathcal{M}} \operatorname{Tr}\left(\left(\widetilde{\nabla_{\mathcal{M}}}\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}(x)\right) g^{-1} \left(\widetilde{\nabla_{\mathcal{M}}}\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}(x)\right)^T\right) ds(x) \, ,
\end{aligned}$$

where the Tr is the trace of the matrix. This, in fact shows that when we use the $|\cdot|^2_{\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^1_{\mathcal{T}\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{M})}$ for regularization, we actually regularize the covariant derivatives.

In the following now introduce the regularization theory for vector fields in ambient space.

3 Regularization in Ambient Space

The main purpose of this paper consists in solving (1.1), where the operator $\widetilde{F}$ is applied to vector fields with range in the tangent bundle. In this chapter we are studying the solution of this problem by embedding the vector fields into an *ambient* space. The regularization approach then requires to extend the operator $\widetilde{F}$ and the associated Hilbert spaces $\widetilde{\mathcal{X}_1}$, $\mathcal{X}_2$ to ambient spaces.

For the sake of simplicity, we select the concrete representation

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{X}_1} = \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^1_{\mathcal{T}\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{M}) \text{ with } \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}(\cdot) = |\cdot|^2_{\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^1_{\mathcal{T}\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{M})} \, , \mathcal{R}(\cdot) = |\cdot|^2_{\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M})} \, , \text{ and } \mathcal{X}_2 = L^2(\mathcal{M}) \, .$$

For all $\widetilde{\mathbf{x}} \in \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^1_{\mathcal{T}\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{M})$ we have $\mathcal{P}_{\vec{\mathbf{n}}}\widetilde{\mathbf{x}} = 0$, hence it follows that

$$|\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}|^2_{\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^1_{\mathcal{T}\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{M})} = \int_{\mathcal{M}} |\mathcal{P}_\tau(x)\nabla_{\mathcal{M}}\mathcal{P}_\tau(x)\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}(x)|^2 \, ds(x) = |\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}|^2_{\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M})} \, .$$

Note that $|\cdot|^2_{\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M})}$ is well-defined on both $\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M})$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^1_{\mathcal{T}\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{M})$, and thus it can be considered as an extension of the functional $|\cdot|^2_{\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^1_{\mathcal{T}\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{M})}$ to ambient space.

3.1 Formulation in Ambient Space

In the following we define an ambient operator F of $\widetilde{F}$ and the associated ambient operator equation, respectively.

Definition 3.1. The ambient operator $F : \mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M}) \to L^2(\mathcal{M})$ is a bounded linear operator which extends $\widetilde{F}$ from $\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^1_{\mathcal{T}\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{M})$ to $\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M})$. That is

$$F\widetilde{\mathbf{x}} = \widetilde{F}\widetilde{\mathbf{x}} \quad \text{for all } \widetilde{\mathbf{x}} \in \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^1_{\mathcal{T}\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{M}) \, .$$

We consider solving the system of equations

$$\begin{pmatrix} F \\ \mathcal{P}_{\vec{\mathbf{n}}} \end{pmatrix} \mathbf{x} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{y} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} . \tag{3.1}$$

We call (3.1) the *ambient operator equation*. The second equation of the system ensures that $\mathbf{x}$ is a tangent vector field.

Tikhonov regularization for solving the ambient operator equation (3.1) consists in minimization of the energy functional

$$\mathcal{T}_{\alpha,\mathbf{y}^\delta}(\mathbf{x}) := \left\| F\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}^\delta \right\|^2_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} + \left\| \mathcal{P}_{\vec{\mathbf{n}}}\mathbf{x} \right\|^2_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} + \alpha \left| \mathbf{x} \right|^2_{\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M})} . \tag{3.2}$$

Lemma 3.2. *Let $\mathcal{D}(\widetilde{F}) = \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^1_{\mathcal{T}\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{M})$ and Assumption 2.1 hold, and F be the operator given by Definition 3.1. Then we have the following.*

1. *$|\cdot|^2_{\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M})} : \mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M}) \to [0,\infty]$ is a proper, convex, and weakly lower-semi continuous functional satisfying $\mathcal{D} := \mathcal{D}(|\cdot|^2_{\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M})}) \cap \mathcal{D}(F) = \mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M})$.*

2. *$\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}_0 \in \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^1_{\mathcal{T}\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{M})$ is a $|\cdot|^2_{\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^1_{\mathcal{T}\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{M})}$ semi-norm minimizing solution of (1.1) if and only if it is a $|\cdot|^2_{\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M})}$ semi-norm minimizing solution of (3.1).*

To prove convergence of the regularization method we still need the following compactness results.

Lemma 3.3. *Let Assumption 2.1 hold, and F be specified as Definition 3.1. Then, for every $\alpha, \theta > 0$, the sets*

$$M_{\alpha,\mathbf{y}}(\theta) := \left\{ \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M}) : \mathcal{T}_{\alpha,\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x}) \le \theta \right\}$$

are weakly sequentially compact in $\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M})$.

Proof. For any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M})$, by Definition 2.3 and Lemma 2.4, we have

$$\mathbf{x} = \mathcal{P}_\tau \mathbf{x} + \mathcal{P}_{\vec{\mathbf{n}}}\mathbf{x} = \widetilde{\mathbf{x}} + \mathbf{n},$$

where $\widetilde{\mathbf{x}} \in \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^1_{\mathcal{T}\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{M})$ and $\mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{H}^1_{\mathcal{N}}(\mathcal{M})$. By Definition 3.1, the operator F fulfils $\left\| \widetilde{F}\widetilde{\mathbf{x}} - F\mathbf{x} \right\|^2_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} = \left\| F\mathbf{n} \right\|^2_{L^2(\mathcal{M})}$. Now, we use the Peter–Paul inequality with $\epsilon > 0$ and get

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \widetilde{F}\widetilde{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{y} \right\|^2_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} &= \left\| \widetilde{F}\widetilde{\mathbf{x}} - F\mathbf{x} + F\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y} \right\|^2_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} \\ &\le (1+\epsilon) \left\| F\mathbf{n} \right\|^2_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} + (1 + \frac{1}{\epsilon}) \left\| F\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y} \right\|^2_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} , \end{aligned}$$

and consequently it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{T}_{\alpha,\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x}) &= \|F\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}\|^2_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} + \|\mathcal{P}_{\vec{\mathbf{n}}}\mathbf{x}\|^2_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} + \alpha\,|\mathbf{x}|^2_{\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M})} \\ &\geq \frac{\epsilon}{1+\epsilon}\left\|\widetilde{F}\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}-\mathbf{y}\right\|^2_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} - \epsilon\,\|F\mathbf{n}\|^2_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} + \|\mathcal{P}_{\vec{\mathbf{n}}}\mathbf{x}\|^2_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} + \alpha\,|\mathbf{x}|^2_{\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M})}\,.\end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

Since $|\mathbf{x}|^2_{\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M})} = |\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}|^2_{\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^1_{\mathcal{T}\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{M})} + |\mathbf{n}|^2_{\mathcal{H}^1_{\mathcal{N}}(\mathcal{M})}$ it follows from (3.3) that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{T}_{\alpha,\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x}) \geq& \frac{\epsilon}{1+\epsilon}\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\alpha,\mathbf{y}}(\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}) + \frac{\alpha}{1+\epsilon}\,|\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}|^2_{\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^1_{\mathcal{T}\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{M})} \\ &+ \|\mathbf{n}\|^2_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} - \epsilon\,\|F\mathbf{n}\|^2_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} + \alpha\,|\mathbf{n}|^2_{\mathcal{H}^1_{\mathcal{N}}(\mathcal{M})}\,.\end{aligned}$$

Choosing $\epsilon = \min\left\{\frac{\alpha}{2\|F\|^2}, \frac{1}{2\|F\|^2}\right\}$, it gives

$$\|\mathbf{n}\|^2_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} - \epsilon\,\|F\mathbf{n}\|^2_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} + \alpha\,|\mathbf{n}|^2_{\mathcal{H}^1_{\mathcal{N}}(\mathcal{M})} \geq 2\epsilon\,\|F\|^2\,\|\mathbf{n}\|^2_{\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M})} - \epsilon\,\|F\|^2\,\|\mathbf{n}\|^2_{\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M})}\,,$$

and subsequently, we have

$$\mathcal{T}_{\alpha,\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x}) \geq \frac{\epsilon}{1+\epsilon}\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\alpha,\mathbf{y}}(\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}) + \frac{\alpha}{1+\epsilon}\,|\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}|^2_{\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^1_{\mathcal{T}\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{M})} + \epsilon\,\|F\|^2\,\|\mathbf{n}\|^2_{\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M})}\ .$$

This estimate shows that every level set of $\mathcal{T}_{\alpha,\mathbf{y}}$ is uniformly bounded in $\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M})$ and thus has a weakly convergent subsequence in $\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M})$. Because of the weak-lower semi-continuity of the norms and semi-norms and the boundedness of F it follows that the limit is also an element of the level set, which gives the assertion. □

Lemma 3.2 and 3.3 guarantee that Assumption 2.1 is satisfied for the ambient operator equation and therefore Theorem 3.10 can be applied which provides well–posedness, stability and convergence of Tikhonov regularization for (3.1).

3.2 Convergence Analysis

In the following, we study the convergence of the regularization in ambient space where we take into account a perturbation of the surface. That is, we consider a family of surfaces $\{\mathcal{M}_\sigma\}_{\sigma>0}$ approximating the surface $\mathcal{M}$, which have to satisfy the following properties:

Assumption 3.4. *$\{\mathcal{M}_\sigma : \sigma > 0\}$ and $\mathcal{M}$ denote surfaces, which satisfy*

- *The surface $\mathcal{M}$ has a C^∞-smooth parametrization $m : [0,1]^2 \to \mathcal{M} \subset \mathbb{R}^3$.*
- *Every surface $\mathcal{M}_\sigma$, $\sigma > 0$ has a C^2-parametrization $m_\sigma : [0,1]^2 \to \mathcal{M}_\sigma \subset \mathbb{R}^3$.*
- *The surfaces are regular, meaning that the determinants of both the metric tensor (see* (A.1)*) and the inverse metric tensor are continuous functions and do not vanish.*

- *Let*
$$\gamma(\sigma) := \|m - m_\sigma\|_{W^{2,\infty}((0,1)^2)} \ . \tag{3.4}$$
We assume that $\gamma : \mathbb{R}^+ \to \mathbb{R}$ is uniformly bounded, monotonically increasing, and satisfies $\gamma(\sigma) \to 0$ as $\sigma \to 0$, which means that $\mathcal{M}_\sigma \to \mathcal{M}$.

In the remainder of this section we shorten the notation and omit part of the subscripts in the (semi)-norms as long as there is no confusion:

$$\begin{gathered}\|\cdot\| := \|\cdot\|_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} \ , |\cdot| := |\cdot|_{\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M})} \ , \|\cdot\|_\sigma := \|\cdot\|_{L^2(\mathcal{M}_\sigma)} \ , |\cdot|_\sigma := |\cdot|_{\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M}_\sigma)} \ , \\ \|\cdot\|_k := \|\cdot\|_{L^2(\mathcal{M}_{\sigma_k})} \ , |\cdot|_k := |\cdot|_{\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M}_{\sigma_k})} \ .\end{gathered} \tag{3.5}$$

The following lemma states that under Assumption 3.4 the regularity of functions is preserved by regular surface transformations.

Lemma 3.5. *Let $\mathcal{X}$ be either $\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M})$ or $L^2(\mathcal{M})$ and accordingly $\mathcal{X}_\sigma$ be either $\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M}_\sigma)$ or $L^2(\mathcal{M}_\sigma)$. If Assumption 3.4 holds, then*

$$\begin{aligned} T_\sigma : \mathcal{X} &\to \mathcal{X}_\sigma \\ \mathbf{x} &\mapsto \mathbf{x} \circ m \circ m_\sigma^{-1} \end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

is well-defined and

$$\begin{aligned} T_\sigma^{-1} : \mathcal{X}_\sigma &\to \mathcal{X} \\ \mathbf{x}_\sigma &\mapsto \mathbf{x}_\sigma \circ m_\sigma \circ m^{-1} \end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

is the inverse of T_σ.

The following corollary summarizes regularity properties of the transformations $T_\sigma^{\pm 1}$.

Corollary 3.6. *Let Assumption 3.4 be satisfied, and moreover, let $\mathcal{X}$ denote either $\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M})$, or $L^2(\mathcal{M})$*

- *T_σ and T_σ^{-1}, which are defined in* (3.6) *and* (3.7) *respectively, are bounded operators between $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{X}_\sigma$. Moreover,*
$$C := \max\left\{\|T_\sigma\|, \left\|T_\sigma^{-1}\right\| : \sigma > 0\right\} < \infty \ . \tag{3.8}$$

- *Moreover,*
$$\left|\|T_\sigma \mathbf{x}\|_{\mathcal{X}_\sigma} - \|\mathbf{x}\|_{\mathcal{X}}\right| = \mathcal{O}(\gamma(\sigma)) \, , \tag{3.9}$$
where this estimate holds uniformly on bounded subsets of $\mathcal{X}$.

- *In addition*
$$\left\|(\mathcal{P}_j)\mathbf{x} - T_\sigma^{-1}(\mathcal{P}_{j_\sigma})T_\sigma \mathbf{x}\right\|_{\mathcal{X}} = \mathcal{O}(\gamma(\sigma)) \, , \quad j = \tau, \vec{\mathbf{n}} \, , \tag{3.10}$$
which holds uniformly on bounded subsets of $\mathcal{X}$.

Next we introduce the ambient operators and data, respectively:

Definition 3.7. The ambient operator according to $\mathcal{M}_\sigma$ is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} F_\sigma : \mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M}_\sigma) &\to L^2(\mathcal{M}_\sigma)\,, \\ \mathbf{x}_\sigma &\mapsto F_\sigma \mathbf{x}_\sigma \end{aligned} \tag{3.11}$$

and the ambient data is defined by

$$\mathbf{y}_\sigma^\delta \in L^2(\mathcal{M}_\sigma)\,. \tag{3.12}$$

The ambient operator and data are assumed to satisfy the following properties:

Assumption 3.8. *Let F be the operator as specified by Definition 3.1.*

- *Then there exists an $|\cdot|^2$-minimizing solution $\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}^\dagger$ of (3.1).*
- *The ambient operator F_σ satisfies*

$$\rho(\sigma) := \left\| T_\sigma^{-1} F_\sigma T_\sigma - F \right\| \to 0 \text{ for } \sigma \to 0\,. \tag{3.13}$$

- *Let $\mathbf{y} = F\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}^\dagger$, the data $\mathbf{y}_\sigma$ according to $\mathcal{M}_\sigma$ satisfies*

$$\left\| \mathbf{y}_\sigma - \mathbf{y}_\sigma^\delta \right\|_\sigma \leq \delta \text{ and } \left\| T_\sigma^{-1}\mathbf{y}_\sigma - \mathbf{y} \right\| = \mathcal{O}(\gamma(\sigma))\,. \tag{3.14}$$

Remark 3.9. *Corollary 3.6 and* (3.14) *imply that*

$$\max\left\{ \left\| T_\sigma^{-1}\mathbf{y}_\sigma^\delta - \mathbf{y} \right\|, \left\| \mathbf{y}_\sigma^\delta - T_\sigma \mathbf{y} \right\|_\sigma \right\} = \mathcal{O}(\gamma(\sigma) + \delta)\,. \tag{3.15}$$

The regularization functional for solving (3.11) is the $\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M}_\sigma)$-seminorm, which is denoted by $|\cdot|_\sigma^2$, and the Tikhonov functional becomes

$$\mathcal{T}_{\alpha,\sigma,\mathbf{y}_\sigma^\delta}(\mathbf{x}_\sigma) := \left\| F_\sigma \mathbf{x}_\sigma - \mathbf{y}_\sigma^\delta \right\|_\sigma^2 + \left\| \mathcal{P}_{\vec{\mathbf{n}}\sigma} \mathbf{x}_\sigma \right\|_\sigma^2 + \alpha \left| \mathbf{x}_\sigma \right|_\sigma^2 \tag{3.16}$$

over all $\mathbf{x}_\sigma \in \mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M}_\sigma)$.

Theorem 3.10. *Let the Assumptions 2.1, 3.4, and 3.8 hold. Let F and F_σ be the operators as specified in Definition 3.1 and 3.7 respectively.*

Moreover, we assume that the parameters (α, γ, ρ)

$$\gamma := \gamma(\sigma) \to 0,\ \rho := \rho(\sigma) \to 0,\ \alpha := \alpha(\sigma, \delta) \to 0\,,$$

are functions of σ, δ and are chosen to satisfy

$$\frac{\rho^2}{\alpha} \to 0,\ \frac{\gamma^2}{\alpha} \to 0 \text{ and } \frac{\delta^2}{\alpha} \to 0, \quad \text{for } \sigma,\ \delta\ \to 0\,. \tag{3.17}$$

Let $(\mathbf{x}_k := \mathbf{x}_{\alpha_k,\sigma_k,\delta_k})$ be a sequence of minimizers of $\mathcal{T}_k := \mathcal{T}_{\alpha_k,\sigma_k,\mathbf{y}_k}$ defined in (3.16) *with $\mathbf{y}_k := \mathbf{y}_{\sigma_k}^{\delta_k}$ satisfying* (3.14)*. In addition we denote by $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_k = T_k^{-1}\mathbf{x}_k \in \mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M})$ the pullback of $\mathbf{x}_k$ onto $\mathcal{M}$.*

- *For $\sigma_k, \delta_k \to 0$ we use the abbreviation $\rho_k := \rho(\sigma_k)$, where ρ is defined in (3.13), $\gamma_k := \gamma(\sigma_k)$ and $\alpha_k := \alpha(\sigma_k, \delta_k)$. Then the limit of every convergent subsequence of $(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_k)$ is a $|\cdot|^2$-minimizing solution.*

- *Moreover, assume that there exists an element $W \in L^2(\mathcal{M})$, such that*

$$F^* W = -\Delta_{\mathcal{T}} \widetilde{\mathbf{x}}^\dagger \,. \tag{3.18}$$

Here $F^* : L^2(\mathcal{M}) \to \mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M})$ is the adjoint operator of F, and $-\Delta_{\mathcal{T}}$ is the Laplace-Beltrami operator for tangent vector fields on $\mathcal{M}$. Then, the $|\cdot|^2$-minimizing solution is unique and satisfies

$$\left|\hat{\mathbf{x}}_k - \widetilde{\mathbf{x}}^\dagger\right|^2 = \mathcal{O}\left(\max\left\{\frac{\rho_k^2}{\alpha_k}, \frac{\gamma_k^2}{\alpha_k}, \frac{\delta_k^2}{\alpha_k}, \gamma_k\right\}\right) \,.$$

Proof. • To prove the first item let $\mathbf{x}_k$ denote the minimizer of $\mathcal{T}_k$ and let $\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}_k^\dagger = T_k \widetilde{\mathbf{x}}^\dagger$ where $T_k := T_{\sigma_k}$. Then, according to the definition of a minimizer

$$\begin{aligned} &\|F_k \mathbf{x}_k - \mathbf{y}_k\|_k^2 + \|\mathcal{P}_{\vec{\mathbf{n}}_k} \mathbf{x}_k\|_k^2 + \alpha_k \left|\mathbf{x}_k\right|_k^2 \\ &\leq \left\|F_k \widetilde{\mathbf{x}}_k^\dagger - \mathbf{y}_k\right\|_k^2 + \left\|\mathcal{P}_{\vec{\mathbf{n}}_k} \widetilde{\mathbf{x}}_k^\dagger\right\|_k^2 + \alpha_k \left|\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}_k^\dagger\right|_k^2 \,. \end{aligned} \tag{3.19}$$

Taking into account that the tangent vector field $\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}^\dagger$ solves $F\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}^\dagger = \mathbf{y}$, Assumption 3.8 and Equations (3.13), (3.15), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\|F_k \widetilde{\mathbf{x}}_k^\dagger - \mathbf{y}_k\right\|_k^2 &= \left\|T_k T_k^{-1}(F_k \widetilde{\mathbf{x}}_k^\dagger - \mathbf{y}_k)\right\|_k^2 \\ &\leq C \left\|T_k^{-1}(F_k \widetilde{\mathbf{x}}_k^\dagger - \mathbf{y}_k)\right\|^2 \\ &= C \left\|T_k^{-1} F_k T_k \widetilde{\mathbf{x}}^\dagger - F\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}^\dagger + \mathbf{y} - T_k^{-1}\mathbf{y}_k\right\|^2 \\ &= \mathcal{O}(\rho_k^2 + \gamma_k^2 + \delta_k^2), \end{aligned} \tag{3.20}$$

Moreover, from (3.10) and the fact that $\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}^\dagger$ is a tangent vector field (meaning that $\mathcal{P}_{\vec{\mathbf{n}}} \widetilde{\mathbf{x}}^\dagger = 0$) it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\|\mathcal{P}_{\vec{\mathbf{n}}_k} \widetilde{\mathbf{x}}_k^\dagger\right\|_k^2 &= \left\|T_k T_k^{-1} \mathcal{P}_{\vec{\mathbf{n}}_k} \widetilde{\mathbf{x}}_k^\dagger\right\|_k^2 \leq C \left\|T_k^{-1}(\mathcal{P}_{\vec{\mathbf{n}}_k} \widetilde{\mathbf{x}}_k^\dagger)\right\|^2 \\ &= C \left\|T_k^{-1} \mathcal{P}_{\vec{\mathbf{n}}_k} T_k \widetilde{\mathbf{x}}^\dagger - \mathcal{P}_{\vec{\mathbf{n}}} \widetilde{\mathbf{x}}^\dagger\right\|^2 = \mathcal{O}(\gamma_k^2). \end{aligned} \tag{3.21}$$

Applying (3.8), (3.9) we find

$$\begin{aligned} \left|\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}_k^\dagger\right|_k^2 = \left|T_k \widetilde{\mathbf{x}}^\dagger\right|_k^2 &\leq \left|\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}^\dagger\right|^2 + \left|\left|T_k \widetilde{\mathbf{x}}^\dagger\right|_k - \left|\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}^\dagger\right|\right| \left(\left|T_k \widetilde{\mathbf{x}}^\dagger\right|_k + \left|\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}^\dagger\right|\right) \\ &= \left|\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}^\dagger\right|^2 + (1+C)\left|\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}^\dagger\right| \left|\left|T_k \widetilde{\mathbf{x}}^\dagger\right|_k - \left|\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}^\dagger\right|\right| = \left|\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}^\dagger\right|^2 + \mathcal{O}(\gamma_k) \,. \end{aligned} \tag{3.22}$$

Using (3.20), (3.21) and (3.22) back to (3.19) shows that

$$\|F_k \mathbf{x}_k - \mathbf{y}_k\|_k^2 + \|\mathcal{P}_{\vec{\mathbf{n}}_k} \mathbf{x}_k\|_k^2 + \alpha_k(|\mathbf{x}_k|_k^2 - \left|\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}^\dagger\right|^2) = \mathcal{O}\left(\max\left\{\rho_k^2, \gamma_k^2, \delta_k^2, \alpha_k \gamma_k\right\}\right). \tag{3.23}$$

Together with the assumptions on the parameters (3.17), (3.23) implies that $\{|\mathbf{x}_k|_k : k \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is uniformly bounded, and consequently it follows from (3.9) that

$$||\hat{\mathbf{x}}_k| - |\mathbf{x}_k|_k| \leq \mathcal{O}(\gamma_k). \tag{3.24}$$

Applying the definition $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_k = T_k^{-1}\mathbf{x}_k$, (3.8), (3.9), (3.23) and (3.24) we find that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|T_k^{-1}F_kT_k\hat{\mathbf{x}}_k - T_k^{-1}\mathbf{y}_k\right\|^2 + \left\|T_k^{-1}\mathcal{P}_{\vec{\mathbf{n}}k}T_k\hat{\mathbf{x}}_k\right\|^2 + \alpha_k\left(|\hat{\mathbf{x}}_k|^2 - \left|\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}^\dagger\right|\right)\\
\leq& C\left(\|F_k\mathbf{x}_k - \mathbf{y}_k\|_k^2 + \|\mathcal{P}_{\vec{\mathbf{n}}k}\mathbf{x}_k\|_k^2\right) + \alpha_k(|\mathbf{x}_k|_k^2 - \left|\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}^\dagger\right|^2)\\
&+ \alpha_k\left||\hat{\mathbf{x}}_k|^2 - |\mathbf{x}_k|_k^2\right|\\
\leq&(1+C)\left(\|F_k\mathbf{x}_k - \mathbf{y}_k\|_k^2 + \|\mathcal{P}_{\vec{\mathbf{n}}k}\mathbf{x}_k\|_k^2 + \alpha_k(|\mathbf{x}_k|_k^2 - \left|\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}^\dagger\right|^2)\right)\\
&+ \alpha_k\left||\hat{\mathbf{x}}_k|^2 - |\mathbf{x}_k|_k^2\right|\\
=&\mathcal{O}\left(\max\left\{\rho_k^2, \gamma_k^2, \delta_k^2, \alpha_k\gamma_k\right\}\right).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.25}$$

From the assumptions on the parameters (3.17) it follows after division of the inequality by α_k and taking the limit $k \to \infty$ afterwards that

$$\limsup_k |\hat{\mathbf{x}}_k|^2 \leq \left|\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}^\dagger\right|^2,$$

and consequently also

$$\lim_k \left(\left\|T_k^{-1}F_kT_k\hat{\mathbf{x}}_k - T_k^{-1}\mathbf{y}_k\right\|^2 + \left\|T_k^{-1}\mathcal{P}_{\vec{\mathbf{n}}k}T_k\hat{\mathbf{x}}_k\right\|^2\right) = 0. \tag{3.26}$$

It follows then from (3.26), (3.13) and (3.10) that both $\|F\hat{\mathbf{x}}_k\|$ and $\|\mathcal{P}_{\vec{\mathbf{n}}}\hat{\mathbf{x}}_k\|$ are uniformly bounded.

Similarly as in [27, Theorem 3.26] it can be seen that for some fixed α_0 the set $\{\mathcal{T}_{\alpha_0,\mathbf{y}}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_k) : k \geq \mathbb{N}_0\}$ is uniformly bounded. Then by the weakly sequentially compactness of the level sets of $\mathcal{T}_{\alpha_0,\mathbf{y}}$ (cf. Lemma 3.3), we have $\{\hat{\mathbf{x}}_k\}$ is bounded in $\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M})$. Thus there is a weakly convergent subsequence of $\{\hat{\mathbf{x}}_k\}$, for which we denote the weak limit by $\bar{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M})$. Using (3.26) it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|F\bar{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{y}\|^2 &= \left\|F\bar{\mathbf{x}} - T_k^{-1}F_kT_k\bar{\mathbf{x}} + T_k^{-1}F_kT_k\bar{\mathbf{x}} - T_k^{-1}\mathbf{y}_k + T_k^{-1}\mathbf{y}_k - \mathbf{y}\right\|^2\\
&\leq \liminf_k \left(\mathcal{O}(\rho_k^2 + \gamma_k^2 + \delta_k^2) + 2\left\|T_k^{-1}F_kT_k\bar{\mathbf{x}} - T_k^{-1}\mathbf{y}_k\right\|^2\right) = 0,\\
\|\mathcal{P}_{\vec{\mathbf{n}}}\bar{\mathbf{x}}\|^2 &= \left\|\mathcal{P}_{\vec{\mathbf{n}}}\bar{\mathbf{x}} - T_k^{-1}\mathcal{P}_{\vec{\mathbf{n}}k}T_k\bar{\mathbf{x}} + T_k^{-1}\mathcal{P}_{\vec{\mathbf{n}}k}T_k\bar{\mathbf{x}}\right\|^2\\
&\leq \liminf_k \left(\mathcal{O}(\gamma_k^2) + 2\left\|T_k^{-1}\mathcal{P}_{\vec{\mathbf{n}}k}T_k\bar{\mathbf{x}}\right\|^2\right) = 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.27}$$

This in particular shows that $\bar{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M})$ is a tangential vector field which solves (3.1). The weakly lower semi-continuity of the semi-norm $|\cdot|$ implies that

$$|\bar{\mathbf{x}}|^2 \leq \liminf_k |\hat{\mathbf{x}}_k|^2 \leq \limsup_k |\hat{\mathbf{x}}_k|^2 \leq \left|\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}^\dagger\right|^2 ,$$

which because $\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}^\dagger$ is a minimum-norm solution tells us that $|\bar{\mathbf{x}}|^2 = \left|\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}^\dagger\right|^2$, and thus $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$ is an $|\cdot|$ minimizing solution of (3.1).

- To prove the convergence rates result we reconsider (3.25). We consider the family of operators $\{T_k^{-1}(F_k, \mathcal{P}_{\vec{\mathbf{n}}k})^T T_k : k \in \mathbb{N}\}$. Using Assumption 3.8 and (3.10) it follows that

$$\left\|T_k^{-1}(F_k, \mathcal{P}_{\vec{\mathbf{n}}k})^T T_k - (F, \mathcal{P}_{\vec{\mathbf{n}}})^T\right\| \leq \mathcal{O}\left(\max\{\rho_k, \gamma_k\}\right) .$$

Moreover, from (3.15) it follows that

$$\left\|T_k^{-1}\mathbf{y}_k - \mathbf{y}\right\| \leq \mathcal{O}(\gamma_k) + \delta_k .$$

We can then apply the results of [24, Thm 2.3] taking into account some additional error terms on the right side of (3.25), and we get

$$\left|\hat{\mathbf{x}}_k - \widetilde{\mathbf{x}}^\dagger\right|^2 = \mathcal{O}\left(\max\left\{\frac{\rho_k^2}{\alpha_k}, \frac{\gamma_k^2}{\alpha_k}, \frac{\delta_k^2}{\alpha_k}, \gamma_k\right\}\right) .$$

□

Remark 3.11. *The assumed equation* (3.18) *is called a* source condition *in the literature (see for instance [7]). If the parameter is chosen in the following way (for instance by appropriate discretization)* $\rho_\sigma = \mathcal{O}(\gamma(\sigma)) = \mathcal{O}(\delta)$*, and we choose the parameter* $\alpha(\sigma, \delta) = \mathcal{O}(\delta)$*, then, we have derive the standard convergence rates*

$$\left|\hat{\mathbf{x}}_k - \widetilde{\mathbf{x}}^\dagger\right|^2 = \mathcal{O}\left(\delta_k\right) .$$

4 Applications

In this section we apply the general regularization results to two imaging problems for tangent vector fields.

4.1 Pulsed Wave Doppler Imaging

Pulsed Wave Doppler (PWD) imaging can be used to visualize the blood flow velocity in biological vessels. The flow field near the inner wall of a vessel in turn provides estimates of the wall shear stress (WSS) of the vessel [5, 16, 20] - see Figure 1 for an illustration. In the figure the red arrows indicate the blood flow velocity, the blue ones show the initializing ultrasound beam directions, and the green ones show the WSS. The reconstruction of **dense velocity fields** from PWD data has been studied first in [1]. This approach reconstructs the velocity

field on a planar slice of the observed tissue, and does not take into account the underlying vessel geometry. Here we study the reconstruction along a vessel wall, which is considered a curved surface.



Figure 1: A schematic diagram for the PWD imaging and WSS of the blood vessel with 2D section.

The mathematical problem formulation is as follows: We denote by $\mathbf{d}_i(x) : \mathbb{R}^3 \to \mathbb{S}^2$, $i = 1, \dots, l$ pairwise different Lipschitz continuous functions, which represent different incident beam directions (see Figure 1). The collected measurement data are noisy variants of $\mathbf{d}_i(x)^T \widetilde{\mathbf{x}}^\dagger$, for each $i = 1, \dots, l$. Moreover, we assume that $(\mathbf{d}_i^T(x))^\perp \mathbf{n}(x) \neq 0$ for all $1 \leq i \leq l$ and for all $x \in \mathcal{M}$, which denotes the inner wall of vessel, where the wall shear stress is determined.

We define the operator $\widetilde{F} = (\widetilde{F}_1, \cdots, \widetilde{F}_l)$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{F}_i : \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^1_{\mathcal{T}\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{M}) &\to L^2(\mathcal{M}), \\ \widetilde{\mathbf{x}} &\mapsto \mathbf{d}_i^T \widetilde{\mathbf{x}} \,. \end{aligned}$$

The associated Tikhonov functional reads as follows

$$\left\| \mathbf{d}^T \widetilde{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{y}^\delta \right\|^2_{(L^2(\mathcal{M}))^l} + \alpha \left| \widetilde{\mathbf{x}} \right|_{\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^1_{\mathcal{T}\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{M})} , \tag{4.1}$$

where $\mathbf{d}(x) = (\mathbf{d}_1, \dots, \mathbf{d}_l)(x)$ and $\mathbf{y}^\delta = (\mathbf{y}_1^\delta, \dots, \mathbf{y}_l^\delta)$. For the coercivity of the functional (4.1), we have

Lemma 4.1. *If $\mathbf{y}^\delta \in L^2(\mathcal{M})$, for $l \geq 2$, the Tikhonov functional* (4.1) *with $\alpha > 0$ is coercive.*

Lemma 4.1 shows that Assumption 2.1 is satisfied for this particular example. The corresponding extended operator F is then given as

$$\begin{aligned} F : \mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M}) &\to (L^2(\mathcal{M}))^l, \\ \mathbf{x} &\mapsto \mathbf{d}^T \mathbf{x}, \qquad \text{on } \mathcal{M} \,. \end{aligned}$$

The ambient space regularization consists in minimizing

$$\mathbf{x}_{\alpha,\delta} := \operatorname{argmin}_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M})} \left\{ \left\| \mathbf{d}^T \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}^\delta \right\|^2_{(L^2(\mathcal{M}))^l} + \left\| \mathcal{P}_{\vec{\mathbf{n}}} \mathbf{x} \right\|^2_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} + \alpha \left| \mathbf{x} \right|^2_{\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M})} \right\} . \tag{4.2}$$

The theoretical results of this paper then provide convergence and stability of the minimizers $\mathbf{x}_{\alpha,\delta}$ of (4.2). That is, provided that there exists a solution $\widetilde{\mathbf{x}} \in \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^1_{\mathcal{T}\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{M})$ of

$$\mathbf{d}^T\widetilde{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{y}\,,$$

- $\mathbf{x}_{\alpha,\delta} \in \mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M})$ is well-defined and there exists an $|\cdot|^2_{\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M})}$-minimizing solution $\mathbf{x}^\dagger$.
- Let $\mathbf{y}^\delta \to \mathbf{y} \in (L^2(\mathcal{M}))^l$ then $\mathbf{x}_{\alpha,\delta} \to \mathbf{x}_{\alpha,0}$ with respect to the $\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M})$-norm.
- Let $\alpha = \alpha(\delta) \to 0$ such that $\delta^2/\alpha(\delta) \to 0$, then $\mathbf{x}_{\alpha(\delta),\delta} \to \mathbf{x}^\dagger$.
- If there exists $w = (w_1, \cdot, w_l)$, where $w_i \in L^2(\mathcal{M})$, such that $\sum_{i=1}^l w_i\mathbf{d}_i = \Delta_{\mathcal{T}}\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}$, that is, the source condition (3.18) is fulfilled, then we have

  $$\left|\mathbf{x}_{\alpha(\delta),\delta} - \mathbf{x}^\dagger\right|_{\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M})} \to 0$$

  at the rates of $\sqrt{\delta}$ as $\alpha(\delta) \sim \delta \to 0$.

For approximated surface $\mathcal{M}_\sigma$, the operator F_σ is then given as

$$\begin{aligned} F_\sigma : \mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M}_\sigma) &\to (L^2(\mathcal{M}_\sigma))^l, \\ \mathbf{x}_\sigma &\mapsto \mathbf{d}^T\mathbf{x}_\sigma\ . \end{aligned}$$

We find that

$$\rho_\sigma = \left\|\mathbf{d} - T_\sigma^{-1}\mathbf{d}\right\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{M})} = \mathcal{O}(\gamma(\sigma)),$$

This is because $\mathbf{d}$ is assumed to be Lipschitz continuous in $\mathbb{R}^3$, and $|x - x_\sigma| \le \|m - m_\sigma\|_{L^\infty} \le \mathcal{O}(\gamma(\sigma))$. Note we do not specify the restriction of $\mathbf{d}$ to $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{M}_\sigma$. We could also assume the blood flow velocity $\mathbf{x}(x)$ is C^1 smooth at where it is close to the inner wall, then the assumption on the data

$$\left\|\mathbf{y}^\delta_\sigma - \mathbf{y}\right\| = \mathcal{O}(\gamma(\sigma) + \delta),$$

can be verified. Since $\mathcal{M}_\sigma$ fulfill the Assumption 3.4, we can have the convergence result of Theorem 3.10 for solving the following approximating Tikhonov minimization

$$\left\|\mathbf{d}^T\mathbf{x}_\sigma - \mathbf{y}^\delta_\sigma\right\|^2_{(L^2(\mathcal{M}_\sigma))^l} + \left\|\mathcal{P}_{\vec{\mathbf{n}}\sigma}\mathbf{x}_\sigma\right\|^2_{(L^2(\mathcal{M}_\sigma))^l} + \alpha\left|\mathbf{x}_\sigma\right|^2_{\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M}_\sigma)}.$$

4.2 Optical Flow Imaging on Manifolds

Optical flow is a method to determine the velocity field from given image data of consisting of consecutive time frames. Routinely this is performed for planar images, but it has also been considered for analyzing image data on stationary surfaces [18, 19], and on moving surfaces [13, 14]. Here, we propose a variational method for determining optical flow on manifolds with regularization in ambient space.

To formulate the operator equation let $I_i : \mathbb{R}^3 \to \mathbb{R} \in C_0^2(\mathbb{R}^3)\,(i \in \mathbb{N})$ denote the intensity function of the image data of frame i. Note that we consider the image data not just concentrated on $\mathcal{M}$ but on $\mathbb{R}^3$. A problem, which falls into this category is cell motion analysis, where the data is recorded by Electronic Microscope [13, 14]. The spatial optical flow equation evaluates the flow for two consecutive frames separately. The according operator equation is

$$\widetilde{F}\widetilde{\mathbf{x}} = (I_1 - I_2) =: \mathbf{y}, \qquad \text{on } \mathcal{M},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{F} : \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^1_{\mathcal{T}\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{M}) &\to L^2(\mathcal{M})\,. \\ \widetilde{\mathbf{x}} &\mapsto (\nabla_{\mathcal{M}} I_1)\widetilde{\mathbf{x}} \end{aligned}$$

Under the assumption that $I_i \in C_0^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$, $\tilde{F}$ is a bounded linear operator. Therefore, we can apply the general results of Section 2 to Tikhonov regularization,

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}_\alpha = \arg\min_{\widetilde{\mathbf{x}} \in \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^1_{\mathcal{T}\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{M})} \|(\nabla_{\mathcal{M}} I_1)\widetilde{\mathbf{x}} - (I_1 - I_2)\|^2_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} + \alpha\, |\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}|^2_{\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^1_{\mathcal{T}\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{M})}\,. \quad (4.3)$$

This method has been proposed in [18, 19] and is referenced as Horn-Schunck method on manifolds in the optical flow community. In these papers coercivity of the functional (4.3) for tangent vector fields has been proven. The existence and convergence of minimizers can be obtained by Theorem 2.2.

We propose the ambient space formulation with the extended operator

$$\begin{aligned} F : \mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M}) &\to L^2(\mathcal{M})\,. \\ \mathbf{x} &\mapsto (\nabla I_1)\mathbf{x} \end{aligned}$$

Note that for a tangent vector filed $\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}$ on $\mathcal{M}$,

$$F\widetilde{\mathbf{x}} = (\nabla I_1)\widetilde{\mathbf{x}} = (\nabla_{\mathcal{M}} I_1)\widetilde{\mathbf{x}} = \widetilde{F}\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}\,.$$

We consider the Tikhonov regularization for recovering the motion fields

$$\mathbf{x}_\alpha = \arg\min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M})} \|(\nabla I_1)\mathbf{x} + I_2 - I_1\|^2_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} + \|\mathcal{P}_{\vec{\mathbf{n}}}\mathbf{x}\|^2_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} + \alpha\, |\mathbf{x}|^2_{\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M})}\,. \quad (4.4)$$

If $\mathcal{M}$ is approximated the optical flow equation is stated as follows:

$$F_\sigma \mathbf{x}_\sigma = I_1 - I_2 =: \mathbf{y}_\sigma \text{ on } \mathcal{M}_\sigma$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} F_\sigma : \mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M}_\sigma) &\to L^2(\mathcal{M}_\sigma)\,. \\ \mathbf{x}_\sigma &\mapsto (\nabla I_1)\mathbf{x}_\sigma \end{aligned}$$

The optical flow method consists in computing $\mathbf{x}_{\sigma,\alpha} \in \mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M}_\sigma)$ that minimizes the functional (4.5)

$$\|(\nabla I_1)\mathbf{x}_\sigma + I_2 - I_1\|^2_{L^2(\mathcal{M}_\sigma)} + \|\mathcal{P}_{\vec{\mathbf{n}}}\mathbf{x}_\sigma\|^2_{L^2(\mathcal{M}_\sigma)} + \alpha\, |\mathbf{x}_\sigma|^2_{\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M}_\sigma)}\,. \quad (4.5)$$

Because $I_i \in C_0^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$ we have

$$\left\|T_\sigma^{-1}\mathbf{y}_\sigma - \mathbf{y}\right\|_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} = \mathcal{O}(\gamma(\sigma)).$$

We also get the estimate of ρ_σ which is defined in (3.13)

$$\rho(\sigma) = \left\|\nabla I_1 - T_\sigma^{-1}(\nabla I_1)\right\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{M})} = \mathcal{O}(\gamma(\sigma)) \ .$$

Note that the last equation makes use of the assumption that I_1 is defined on all of $\mathbb{R}^3$. Therefore the restriction of I_1 to $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{M}_\sigma$ is not specified.

Thus, we can apply the general results of this paper to have the stability and convergence of the approach, as well as the convergence rate once the source condition (3.18) are satisfied, i.e. there is a scalar function $W \in L^2(\mathcal{M})$, such that $W(\nabla_{\mathcal{M}} I_1) = \Delta_{\mathcal{T}} \widetilde{\mathbf{x}}^\dagger$. Especially, if one can choose the parameter $\alpha(\sigma, \delta) = \mathcal{O}(\delta) = \mathcal{O}(\gamma(\sigma))$ in the Tikhonov functional (4.5), then, we have the results on the convergence rate of the minimizer $\mathbf{x}_{\sigma,\alpha}$

$$\left|T_\sigma^{-1}\mathbf{x}_{\sigma,\alpha} - \widetilde{\mathbf{x}}^\dagger\right|^2_{\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M})} = \mathcal{O}(\delta).$$

5 Conclusion

In this paper we have studied Tikhonov regularization for solving ill–posed operator equations where the solutions are functions from a surface to the tangent bundles. Such problems appear in a variety of applications such as pulsed wave Doppler imaging and optical flow imaging on surfaces. We extended the existing theory of finite dimensional approximations of Tikhonov regularized solutions for ill–posed operator equations to the surface setting. The additional features of this theory are, that it allows to take into account perturbations of the surface and the tangent bundle, and that it provides an optimal convergence rate by balancing all these parameters according to the level of errors.

Acknowledgement

The work has been supported by the Austrian Science Fund (FWF) within the national research network Geometry and Simulation, projects S11704 and S11707.

A Appendix: Background on Manifolds and Vector Fields

Throughout this paper we use the following conventions and definitions:

- $(\mathcal{M}, g)$ denotes a two-dimensional smooth and compact surface in $\mathbb{R}^3$, which has bounded curvature, and is associated with the Riemannian metric g.

- $\mathcal{T}_x\mathcal{M}$, $\mathcal{N}_x\mathcal{M}$ denote the tangent and normal vector spaces at $x \in \mathcal{M}$, respectively. The tangent and normal bundle are defined by

$$\mathcal{T}\mathcal{M} = \bigcup_{x\in\mathcal{M}} \{(x, \mathbf{v}) : \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{T}_x\mathcal{M}\}$$

and

$$\mathcal{N}\mathcal{M} = \bigcup_{x\in\mathcal{M}} \{(x, \mathbf{v}) : \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{N}_x\mathcal{M}\} \,,$$

respectively.

- To simplify the representation we assume that the surface $\mathcal{M}$ is parametrizable, that is $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^3$ can be represented by a map $m : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^3$,

$$\mathcal{M} = m(\Omega)\,,$$

where $\Omega := [0, 1]^2 \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$, and $m : \Omega \to \mathcal{M}$ is a regular parametrization. In particular we assume that m is bijective and the inverse $m^{-1} : \mathcal{M} \to \Omega$ is also a regular map.

We denote by

$$\partial m(\zeta) = [\partial_1 m,\ \partial_2 m](\zeta) \in \mathbb{R}^{3\times 2}$$

the *Jacobian* of the parametrization at $x = m(\zeta) \in \mathcal{M}$. The parameters in Ω are denoted by ζ. The derivatives with respect to these parameters are always denoted by ∂.

- The *metric tensor* g is related to the parametrization m by

$$g(\zeta) = (\partial m(\zeta))^T \partial m(\zeta) \in \mathbb{R}^{2\times 2} \tag{A.1}$$

on $\mathcal{M}$ at $x = m(\zeta)$.

- Let $f : \mathcal{M} \to \mathbb{R}$, then the surface integral fulfills

$$\int_{\mathcal{M}} f(x) ds(x) = \int_{\Omega} f(\zeta)\, \sqrt{\det g(\zeta)} d\zeta \,.$$

- We call a vector field a *tangent vector field* if $\tilde{\mathbf{v}} : \mathcal{M} \to \mathbb{R}^3$ with range in the tangent bundle $\mathcal{T}\mathcal{M}$, that is, $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}(x) \in \mathcal{T}_x\mathcal{M}$ for all $x \in \mathcal{M}$. Every tangent vector $\tilde{V}(x) \in \mathcal{T}_x\mathcal{M}$ can be represented in terms of the tangential basis $(\partial_i m(\zeta))_{i=1,2}$, at each $x = m(\zeta)$, via

$$\tilde{\mathbf{v}}(x) = \partial m(\zeta)(\hat{v}_1(\zeta), \hat{v}_2(\zeta))^T \in \mathbb{R}^{3\times 3} \,. \tag{A.2}$$

For two tangent vector field $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}(x)$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}(x)$, using (A.2), we have the relation

$$\begin{aligned} g(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}, \tilde{\mathbf{u}}) &:= (\hat{v}_1(\zeta), \hat{v}_2(\zeta))\, \underbrace{(\partial m(\zeta))^T \partial m(\zeta)}_{=g(\zeta)} (\hat{u}_1(\zeta), \hat{u}_2(\zeta))^T \\ &= \tilde{\mathbf{v}}^T \tilde{\mathbf{u}} \,. \end{aligned}$$

- We denote by $\vec{\mathbf{n}}(x) = (n_1(x), n_2(x), n_3(x))^T \in \mathbb{R}^3$ the unit normal vector of $\mathcal{M}$ at $x \in \mathcal{M}$ with fixed orientation. We denote by $\mathcal{P}_\tau$ and $\mathcal{P}_{\vec{\mathbf{n}}}$ the projections onto $\mathcal{TM}$, $\mathcal{NM}$ at a point $x \in \mathcal{M}$ respectively. They are represented by matrices

$$\mathcal{P}_{\vec{\mathbf{n}}}(x) = \vec{\mathbf{n}}(x)\vec{\mathbf{n}}(x)^T \in \mathbb{R}^{3\times 3} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{P}_\tau(x) = \mathcal{I} - \mathcal{P}_{\vec{\mathbf{n}}}(x) \in \mathbb{R}^{3\times 3}, \quad \text{(A.3)}$$

  where $\mathcal{I}$ is the 3×3 identity matrix.

  Moreover, we have the relation between the parametrization and the projection

$$\mathcal{P}_\tau(x) = \partial m(\zeta) g^{-1}(\zeta)(\partial m(\zeta))^T$$

  for $x = m(\zeta)$. We denote by

$$(\partial m(\zeta))^\dagger = g^{-1}(\zeta)(\partial m)^T(\zeta) \in \mathbb{R}^{2\times 3}\,, \quad \text{(A.4)}$$

  the Moore-Penrose inverse of the matrix $\partial m(\zeta) \in \mathbb{R}^{3\times 2}$, which satisfies

$$(\partial m(\zeta))^\dagger \partial m(\zeta) = \mathrm{id}(\zeta) \in \mathbb{R}^{2\times 2} \text{ and } \partial m(\zeta)(\partial m(\zeta))^\dagger = \mathcal{P}_\tau(m(\zeta)) \in \mathbb{R}^{3\times 3}\,.$$

- For a scalar field $v : \mathcal{M} \to \mathbb{R}$, we define its *gradient with respect to the surface* $\mathcal{M}$ at a point $x = m(\zeta)$ by

$$\nabla_{\mathcal{M}} v(x) := \left(\partial(v \circ m)\,(\partial m)^\dagger\right) \circ m^{-1}(x) \in \mathbb{R}^{1\times 3}\,. \quad \text{(A.5)}$$

  The surface gradient fulfills the relation

$$\nabla_{\mathcal{M}} v(m(\zeta))\,\partial m(\zeta) = \partial(v \circ m)(\zeta) \in \mathbb{R}^{1\times 2}. \quad \text{(A.6)}$$

- Given a vector valued function $\mathbf{v} : \mathcal{M} \to \mathbb{R}^3$, the definition of the *gradient with respect to the surface* $\nabla_{\mathcal{M}}$ consists in taking the gradient of each scalar component v_i, i.e., for $x = m(\zeta)$ we have

$$\nabla_{\mathcal{M}} \mathbf{v}(x) := \begin{pmatrix} \nabla_{\mathcal{M}} v_1(x) \\ \nabla_{\mathcal{M}} v_2(x) \\ \nabla_{\mathcal{M}} v_3(x) \end{pmatrix} = \left(\partial(\mathbf{v} \circ m)(\zeta)(\partial m(\zeta))^\dagger\right) \circ m^{-1}(x) \in \mathbb{R}^{3\times 3}. \quad \text{(A.7)}$$

- Every vector field $\mathbf{v} : \mathcal{M} \to \mathbb{R}^3$ can be decomposed into the two vector fields $\mathcal{P}_\tau \mathbf{v}$ and $\mathcal{P}_{\vec{\mathbf{n}}}\mathbf{v}$ which have ranges in $\mathcal{N}_x\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{T}_x\mathcal{M}$ respectively for all $x \in \mathcal{M}$.

- The *covariant derivative* of a tangent vector field $\tilde{V}$ is defined as follows, see e.g. [17, 4]. Equation (A.2) states that

$$\tilde{\mathbf{v}}(m(\zeta)) = \partial m(\zeta)(\hat{v}_1(\zeta), \hat{v}_2(\zeta))^T = \sum_{k=1}^{2} \hat{v}_k(\zeta)\partial_k m(\zeta)\,,$$

where $\hat{v}_k : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ denotes the local coordinate representation with respect to the basis $(\partial_k m)_{k=1,2}$. The *covariant derivative* in direction k with respect to tangent basis ∂m, $(\tilde{\nabla}_k \tilde{\mathbf{v}})_{k=1,2}$, is defined (see e.g. [6]) by the orthogonal projection of

$$\partial_k(\tilde{\mathbf{v}} \circ m)(\zeta) = \sum_{i=1}^{2} \partial_k \hat{v}_i(\zeta) \partial_i m(\zeta) + \sum_{i=1}^{2} \hat{v}_i(\zeta) \partial_{ik} m(\zeta)$$

into the tangent space. That is, for $x = m(\zeta)$, the *covariant derivative* is given by

$$\widetilde{\nabla_{\mathcal{M}}} \tilde{\mathbf{v}}(m(\zeta)) = \mathcal{P}_\tau(m(\zeta))[\partial_1(\tilde{\mathbf{v}} \circ m)(\zeta), \partial_2(\tilde{\mathbf{v}} \circ m)(\zeta)] \,. \tag{A.8}$$

In particular for a tangent vector field $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}$ at $x = m(\zeta)$ it follows from (A.8) and (A.7) that

$$\widetilde{\nabla_{\mathcal{M}}} \tilde{\mathbf{v}}(x)(\partial m(\zeta))^\dagger = \mathcal{P}_\tau(x) \nabla_{\mathcal{M}} \tilde{\mathbf{v}}(m(\zeta)) \,. \tag{A.9}$$

Moreover, for an arbitrary vector field $\mathbf{v} : \mathcal{M} \to \mathbb{R}^3$ we have

$$\widetilde{\nabla_{\mathcal{M}}}(\mathcal{P}_\tau \mathbf{v})(x)(\partial m(\zeta))^\dagger = \mathcal{P}_\tau(x) \nabla_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{P}_\tau \mathbf{v})(x) \,.$$

In Figure 2 we give a schematic representation of the surface $\mathcal{M}$, its parametrization m over the coordinate domain Ω, as well as the vector spaces $\mathcal{T}_x\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{N}_x\mathcal{M}$. For convenience, in Table 1 we collect the geometric notations which are



Figure 2: Geometry mapping and vector spaces

used throughout this paper.

In the following we present a few results, which we need to characterize Sobolev spaces.

Lemma A.1. *The gradient operator $\nabla_{\mathcal{M}}$ is independent of the parameterization, and fulfils standard rules of differentiation, such as the product rule*

1. *Let $v, w : \mathcal{M} \to \mathbb{R}$ be differentiable, then*

$$\nabla_{\mathcal{M}}(vw) = v \nabla_{\mathcal{M}} w + w \nabla_{\mathcal{M}} v.$$

2. *Moreover, let $\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{z} : \mathcal{M} \to \mathbb{R}^3$, then*

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathbf{v}^T \mathbf{w}) &= \mathbf{v}^T \nabla_{\mathcal{M}} \mathbf{w} + W^T \nabla_{\mathcal{M}} \mathbf{v} \,, \\ \nabla_{\mathcal{M}}(v\mathbf{w}) &= \mathbf{w} \nabla_{\mathcal{M}} v + v \nabla_{\mathcal{M}} \mathbf{w} \,, \\ \nabla_{\mathcal{M}}((\mathbf{v}^T \mathbf{w})\mathbf{z}) &= \mathbf{z}\mathbf{v}^T \nabla_{\mathcal{M}} \mathbf{w} + \mathbf{z}\mathbf{w}^T \nabla_{\mathcal{M}} \mathbf{v} + (\mathbf{v}^T \mathbf{w}) \nabla_{\mathcal{M}} \mathbf{z}. \end{aligned}$$

Table 1: Notation corresponding to the geometry

Notation	Remark	**Notation**	Remark
$\mathcal{M}$	a parametrizable surface	g	metric tensor
m	mapping $m : \Omega \to \mathcal{M}$	∂m	Jacobian of m
$\mathcal{TM}$	tangent vector bundle	$\mathcal{NM}$	normal vector bundle
$\mathcal{P}_\tau$	tangent projection	$\mathcal{P}_{\vec{\mathbf{n}}}$	normal projection
$\vec{\mathbf{n}}$	unit normal vector	$g(\cdot,\cdot)$	inner product on $\mathcal{TM}$
$\partial_i m$	tangent basis vector		

Lemma A.2. *Let $\vec{\mathbf{n}}(x) = (n_1(x), n_2(x), n_3(x))^T$ the unit normal vector field on $\mathcal{M}$, and let $\mathbf{v} : \mathcal{M} \to \mathbb{R}^3$ be a differentiable vector field, then*

1. *The following formulas hold*

$$\vec{\mathbf{n}}^T \nabla_{\mathcal{M}} \vec{\mathbf{n}} = 0\,, \quad \mathcal{P}_\tau \nabla_{\mathcal{M}} \vec{\mathbf{n}} = \nabla_{\mathcal{M}} \vec{\mathbf{n}} \text{ and } \mathcal{P}_\tau \vec{\mathbf{n}} = 0\,,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}_\tau \nabla_{\mathcal{M}} (\mathcal{P}_\tau \mathbf{v}) &= \mathcal{P}_\tau \nabla_{\mathcal{M}} \mathbf{v} - (\vec{\mathbf{n}}^T \mathbf{v}) \nabla_{\mathcal{M}} \vec{\mathbf{n}}\,, \\ \mathcal{P}_{\vec{\mathbf{n}}} \nabla_{\mathcal{M}} (\mathcal{P}_{\vec{\mathbf{n}}} \mathbf{v}) &= \mathcal{P}_{\vec{\mathbf{n}}} \nabla_{\mathcal{M}} \mathbf{v} + \vec{\mathbf{n}} \mathbf{v}^T \nabla_{\mathcal{M}} \vec{\mathbf{n}}\,. \end{aligned}$$

2. *Moreover, the semi-norm can be represented by*

$$|\mathbf{v}|^2_{\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M})} = \left\| \nabla_{\mathcal{M}} \mathbf{v} - (\vec{\mathbf{n}}^T \mathbf{v}) \nabla_{\mathcal{M}} \vec{\mathbf{n}} + \vec{\mathbf{n}} \mathbf{v}^T \nabla_{\mathcal{M}} \vec{\mathbf{n}} \right\|^2_{L^2(\mathcal{M})}\,.$$

Proof. For the first item, since $\vec{\mathbf{n}}$ is a unit normal vector field,

$$\vec{\mathbf{n}}^T(x) \vec{\mathbf{n}}(x) = 1\,, \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{M}\,.$$

Then from Lemma A.1 it follows that

$$2\vec{\mathbf{n}}^T(x) \nabla_{\mathcal{M}} \vec{\mathbf{n}}(x) = \nabla_{\mathcal{M}} (\vec{\mathbf{n}}^T(x) \vec{\mathbf{n}}(x)) = 0.$$

Moreover, $\mathcal{P}_\tau(x) = \mathcal{I} - \vec{\mathbf{n}}(x) \vec{\mathbf{n}}^T(x)$, and thus from the previous it follows that

$$\mathcal{P}_\tau(x) \nabla_{\mathcal{M}} \vec{\mathbf{n}}(x) = \mathcal{I} \nabla_{\mathcal{M}} \vec{\mathbf{n}}(x) - \vec{\mathbf{n}}(x) \vec{\mathbf{n}}^T(x) \nabla_{\mathcal{M}} \vec{\mathbf{n}}(x) = \nabla_{\mathcal{M}} \vec{\mathbf{n}}(x)\,.$$

We apply the product rules in Lemma A.1 and properties of $\vec{\mathbf{n}}$ derived above, which show that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}_\tau \nabla_{\mathcal{M}} (\mathcal{P}_\tau \mathbf{v}) &= \mathcal{P}_\tau \nabla_{\mathcal{M}} (\mathbf{v} - (\vec{\mathbf{n}}^T \mathbf{v}) \vec{\mathbf{n}}) \\ &= \mathcal{P}_\tau (\nabla_{\mathcal{M}} \mathbf{v} - \vec{\mathbf{n}} \vec{\mathbf{n}}^T \nabla_{\mathcal{M}} \mathbf{v} - \vec{\mathbf{n}} \mathbf{v}^T \nabla_{\mathcal{M}} \vec{\mathbf{n}} - (\vec{\mathbf{n}}^T \mathbf{v}) \nabla_{\mathcal{M}} \vec{\mathbf{n}}) \\ &= \mathcal{P}_\tau \nabla_{\mathcal{M}} \mathbf{v} - (\vec{\mathbf{n}}^T \mathbf{v}) \nabla_{\mathcal{M}} \vec{\mathbf{n}}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{P}_{\vec{\mathbf{n}}}\nabla_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{P}_{\vec{\mathbf{n}}}\mathbf{v}) &= \mathcal{P}_{\vec{\mathbf{n}}}\nabla_{\mathcal{M}}((\vec{\mathbf{n}}^T\mathbf{v})\vec{\mathbf{n}}) \\ &= \mathcal{P}_{\vec{\mathbf{n}}}(\vec{\mathbf{n}}\vec{\mathbf{n}}^T\nabla_{\mathcal{M}}\mathbf{v} + \vec{\mathbf{n}}\mathbf{v}^T\nabla_{\mathcal{M}}\vec{\mathbf{n}} + (\vec{\mathbf{n}}^T\mathbf{v})\nabla_{\mathcal{M}}\vec{\mathbf{n}}) \\ &= \mathcal{P}_{\vec{\mathbf{n}}}\nabla_{\mathcal{M}}\mathbf{v} + \vec{\mathbf{n}}\mathbf{v}^T\nabla_{\mathcal{M}}\vec{\mathbf{n}}.\end{aligned}$$

Adding the two identities, and using the orthogonality of $\mathcal{P}_\tau$ and $\mathcal{P}_{\vec{\mathbf{n}}}$ on $L^2(\mathcal{M})$, we get the second item from Definition 2.3:

$$\begin{aligned}&\left\|\nabla_{\mathcal{M}}\mathbf{v} - (\vec{\mathbf{n}}^T\mathbf{v})\nabla_{\mathcal{M}}\vec{\mathbf{n}} + \vec{\mathbf{n}}\mathbf{v}^T\nabla_{\mathcal{M}}\vec{\mathbf{n}}\right\|^2_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} \\ =& \|\mathcal{P}_\tau\nabla_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{P}_\tau\mathbf{v}) + \mathcal{P}_{\vec{\mathbf{n}}}\nabla_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{P}_{\vec{\mathbf{n}}}\mathbf{v})\|^2_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} \\ =& \|\mathcal{P}_\tau\nabla_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{P}_\tau\mathbf{v})\|^2_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} + \|\mathcal{P}_{\vec{\mathbf{n}}}\nabla_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{P}_{\vec{\mathbf{n}}}\mathbf{v})\|^2_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} \\ =& |\mathbf{v}|^2_{\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{M})} \ .\end{aligned}$$

This conclude the proof. □

References

[1] M. Arigovindan, M. Suhling, C. Jansen, P. Hunziker, and M. Unser. Full motion and flow field recovery from echo doppler data. *IEEE Trans. Med. Imag.*, 26:31–45, 2007.

[2] A.B. Bakushinskii and A.V. Goncharskii. *Ill-Posed Problems: Theory and Applications*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, Boston, London, 1994.

[3] M. Burger and S. Osher. Convergence rates of convex variational regularization. *Inverse Probl.*, 20(5):1411–1421, 2004.

[4] M. P. do Carmo. *Riemannian Geometry*. Birkhäuser, 1992.

[5] F. Durst, H. Hikura, I. Lekakis, J. Jpvampvoc, and Q. Ye. Wall shear stress determination from near-wall mean velocity data in turbulent pipe and channel flows. *Expe. Fluids*, 20(6):417–428, 1996.

[6] B. A. Dubrovin, A.T. Fomenko, and S.P. Novikov. *Modern Geometry - Methods and Applications: Part I: The Geometry of Surfaces, Transformation Groups, and Fields*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics. Spinger, 2 edition, 1991. Tanslated by Burns, R.G.

[7] H. W. Engl, M. Hanke, and A. Neubauer. *Regularization of inverse problems*, volume 375 of *Mathematics and its Applications*. Kluwer Academic Publishers Group, Dordrecht, 1996.

[8] H.D. Evans and W. N. McDicken. *Doppler Ultrasound: Physics, Instrumentation and Signal Processing*. 2nd Edition. Wiley, 2000.

[9] C. W. Groetsch. *The Theory of Tikhonov Regularization for Fredholm Equations of the First Kind*. Pitman, Boston, 1984.

[10] L. Galiuto, G. Ignone, and A. Demaria. Contraction and relaxation velocities of the normal left ventricle using pulsed-wave tissue doppler echocardiography. *Amer. J. Cardiol*, 81(5):609–614, 1998.

[11] B. Hofmann, B. Kaltenbacher, C. Pöschl, and O. Scherzer. A convergence rates result for Tikhonov regularization in Banach spaces with non-smooth operators. *Inverse Probl.*, 23(3):987–1010, 2007.

[12] C.K. Holland, M.J. Clancy, K.J. Taylor, J.L. Alderman, K. Purushothaman, and T.R. McCauley. Volumetric flow estimation in vivo and in vitro using pulsed-doppler ultrasound. *Ultrasound Med. Biol.*, 22(5):591–603, 1996.

[13] C. Kirisits, L. F. Lang, and O. Scherzer. Optical flow on evolving surfaces with an application to the analysis of 4D microscopy data. In A. Kuijper, K. Bredies, T. Pock, and H. Bischof, editors, *SSVM'13: Proceedings of the fourth International Conference on Scale Space and Variational Methods in Computer Vision*, volume 7893 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 246–257, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2013. Springer-Verlag.

[14] C. Kirisits, L. F. Lang, and O. Scherzer. Optical flow on evolving surfaces with space and time regularisation. *J. Math. Imaging Vision*, 52(1):55–70, 2015.

[15] C. Kirisits, C. Pöschl, E. Resmerita, and O. Scherzer. Finite-dimensional approximation of convex regularization via hexagonal pixel grids. *Appl. Anal.*, 94(3):612–636, 2015.

[16] D. Ku, D. Giddens, C. Zarins, and S. Glagov. Pulsatile flow and artherosclerosis in the human carotid bifurcation—positive correlation between plaque location and oscillating shear stress. *Artherosclerosis*, 5(3):293–302, 1985.

[17] J. M. Lee. *Riemannian surfaces*, volume 176 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1997. An introduction to curvature.

[18] J. Lefèvre and S. Baillet. Optical flow and advection on 2-Riemannian surfaces: A common framework. *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell.*, 30(6):1081–1092, June 2008.

[19] J. Lefèvre and S. Baillet. Estimation of velocity fields and propagation on non-euclidian domains: Application to the exploration of cortical spatiotemporal dynamics. In H. Ammari, editor, *Mathematical Modeling in Biomedical Imaging I*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, pages 203–226. Springer, 2009.

[20] C. Meierhofer, E. P. Schneider, C. Lyko, A. Hutter, and et al. Wall shear stress and flow patterns in the ascending aorta in patients with bicuspid aortic valves differ significantly from tricuspid aortic valves: a prospective study. 14:797–804, 2013.

[21] V. A. Morozov. *Methods for Solving Incorrectly Posed Problems*. Springer, New York, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1984.

[22] J. L. Mueller and S. Siltanen. *Linear and nonlinear inverse problems with practical applications*, volume 10 of *Computational Science & Engineering*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM), Philadelphia, PA, 2012.

[23] A. Neubauer. Tikhonov regularization for non-linear ill-posed problems: optimal convergence rates and finite-dimensional approximation. *Inverse Probl.*, 5(4):541–557, 1989.

[24] A. Neubauer and O. Scherzer. Finite-dimensional approximation of Tikhonov regularized solutions of nonlinear ill-posed problems. *Numer. Funct. Anal. Optim.*, 11(1-2):85–99, 1990.

[25] C. Pöschl, E. Resmerita, and O. Scherzer. Discretization of variational regularization in Banach spaces. *Inverse Probl.*, 26(10):105017, 2010.

[26] E. Resmerita and O. Scherzer. Error estimates for non-quadratic regularization and the relation to enhancement. *Inverse Probl.*, 22(3):801–814, 2006.

[27] O. Scherzer, M. Grasmair, H. Grossauer, M. Haltmeier, and F. Lenzen. *Variational methods in imaging*, volume 167 of *Applied Mathematical Sciences*. Springer, New York, 2009.

[28] T. Schuster, B. Kaltenbacher, B. Hofmann, and K. S. Kazimierski. *Regularization methods in Banach spaces*, volume 10 of *Radon Series on Computational and Applied Mathematics*. Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co. KG, Berlin, 2012.

[29] V. P. Tanana. *Methods for solution of nonlinear operator equations*. Inverse and Ill-posed Problems Series. VSP, Utrecht, 1997.

[30] A. N. Tikhonov and V. Y. Arsenin. *Solutions of Ill-Posed Problems*. John Wiley & Sons, Washington, D.C., 1977.

[31] A. N. Tikhonov, A. Goncharsky, V. Stepanov, and A. Yagola. *Numerical Methods for the Solution of Ill-Posed Problems*. Kluwer, Dordrecht, 1995.

[32] A. N. Tikhonov, A. S. Leonov, and A. G. Yagola. *Nonlinear ill-posed problems. Vol. 1, 2*, volume 14 of *Applied Mathematics and Mathematical Computation*. Chapman & Hall, London, 1998. Translated from the Russian.